

REMARKS

The office action of March 22, 2007, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 1 is objected to for containing various informalities.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Grove in view of either the patent to Suzuki et al., the patent to Gladwin or the patent to Savage.

In view of the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claim 3 and amended claims 1, 5, 6 and 9.

Applicant has amended claim to address the informalities pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted

that the objection to claim 1 as containing informalities is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the instances of indefiniteness pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the patent to Grove, it can be seen that this patent discloses a continuous metal casting mold. The Examiner combined this reference with either Suzuki, et al., Gladwin or Savage in determining that claims 1 and 3-10 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that none of these references, nor

their combination, teach a continuous casting mold as in the presently claimed invention. None of the references, nor any of the combinations of references presented by the Examiner, teach or suggest a construction of a continuous casting mold in which the coolant channels run in the copper plate and at least partially in the adjacent steel charging plate, and the coolant channel has a cross section that is smaller in a meniscus region than elsewhere in the coolant channel. There is no mention by any of the references of a mold having such a construction, nor would it be obvious to modify the structures of any of the references to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over combinations of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.



HM-620

Respectfully submitted,

By

Klaus P. Stoffel  
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner

Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: August 22, 2007

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 22, 2007.

By:

  
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: August 22, 2007